ON THE NOMENCLATURE AND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE LAMPREYS.

By Theodore Gill, M. D., Ph. D.

In 1870, Dr. Günther took up the name Petromyzon branchialis for what was before generally called P. planeri. In 1882, assuming the correctness of that determination and that there were good reasons for the identification, I accepted it and also the name Ammocates, based on the P. branchialis, for the genus called Lampetra by Gray. It was with much reluctance that I took such a step, and only in deference to the rules of nomenclature regulating such cases, common among the acalephs, especially the hydroids, but rare among vertebrates. The reluctance to adopt the name Ammocates with this new range has, I am sure, been shared by many others, and expression has lately been given to it by Prof. Gage in his valuable memoir on "The Lake and Brook Lampreys of New York" (Wilder book, p. 437). Prof. Gage's own researches appear to furnish a perfectly legitimate way out of the dilemma.

According to Prof. Gage (op. cit., p. 456), "up to the present time there has been no way discovered of distinguishing the larvæ of the lake and of the brook lamprey. As the two species occupy the same spawning ground and sometimes spawn in the same nest great care is necessary in order not to confuse the two. After the larvæ leave the nest they apparently go to the same sand bed."*

^{*} The after life of the species is, however, quite different.

[&]quot;The brook lamprey does not apparently increase in length after transformation, for many of the transformed ones at the spawning season are of less size than the just transformed ones."

[&]quot;The lake lamprey upon transforming is only about one-half to one-fourth the length and probably not one-teuth bulk of the spawning ones." (Gage, op. cit., pp. 452, 453.)

A lamprey half the length of another would equal an eighth of the bulk, and one a fourth the length would only reach one-sixty-fourth the bulk, if the proportions corresponded.

As Prof. Gage had unusual opportunities for investigation, and "since 1875 lost no opportunity of studying the lampreys at all stages of life" (op. cit., p. 423), his conclusions are especially valuable, and may be safely used in a reconsideration of the question of nomenclature.

Why has Ammocates branchialis, then, been identified specifically with Petromyzon planeri, thus necessitating the restoration of the former name?

AMMŒCETES COMMON TO ALL ARCTOGÆAN LAMPREYS.

The memorable researches of Dr. August Müller, resulting in the discovery that an Ammocœtes was simply a larva of a lamprey, happened to be conducted where the Petromyzon planeri was the species at hand, and, inasmuch as the larva in his possession developed into Petromyzon planeri, the identification was correct. The mistake (if it can be considered as such) was in assuming that every Ammocætes was a larval Petromyzon planeri, and that the Ammocætes or P. branchialis of Linné was specifically identical with P. planeri and with that alone.

It now appears that what would be determinable as an Ammocætes branchialis may be the larva of any arctogean lamprey, inasmuch as the lake lamprey (Petromyzon marinus var.) and brook lamprey (Lampetra sp.*) are most distinct from each other. Inasmuch also as the sea lamprey (Petromyzon marinus) ascends fresh-water streams to breed, there was no reason for identifying P. branchialis with one rather than another species, the definition applying to one as well as to another, and doubtless the larvæ of the three European species (P. marinus, P. fluviatilis, and P. planeri) have been frequently, if not habitually, confused. It follows, therefore, that P. branchialis (Linné) and Ammocætes are generic rather than specific synonyms and should be so treated. The name Lampetra may be, consequently, revived for the fresh-water lampreys of Europe and eastern America and the synonymy digested as follows.

SYNONYMY.

Genus PETROMYZON.

- Petromyzon, LINNÆUS, Syst. Nat., ed. 10., v. 1, p. 230, 1758.
- < Petromyzon, (DUMÉRIL) CUVIER, Règne Animal, t. 2, p. 118, 1817.
- Ammocates, (Duméril) Cuvier, Règne Animal [1e éd.], t. 2, p. 119, 1817 (based on larval form).
- = Petromyzon, Gray, Proc. Zool. Soc. London, pt. 19, pp. 235, 236; List Specimens Fish Brit. Mus., pt. 1, p. 137, pl. 1, f. 1 (mouth), 1851.
- = Lampetra, Malm, Forhandl. Skand. Naturf., 8. möde, p. 580, 1860.
- < Petromyzon, GÜNTHER, Cat. Fishes Brit. Mns., v. 8, p. 500, 1870.

^{*} The specific identity of either the European Lampetra planeri or L. fluriatilis with an American species is very doubtful and at least requires verification.

Genus LAMPETRA.

- ?? Lampreda, RAFINESQUE, Analyse de la Nature, p. 94 (without description or typonym), 1815.
- ?? Pricus, Rafinesque, Analyse de la Nature, p. 94 (without description or typonym), 1815.
- = Lampetra, Gray, Proc. Zool. Soc. London, pt. 19, pp. 235, 237, 1851; List Specimens Fish Brit. Mus., pt. 1, pp. 137, 140, pl. 1, f. 2 (mouth), 1851.
- ? Scolecosoma, Girard, Expl. and Surveys for R. R. Route to Pacific Oc., v. 10. Fishes, p. 384, 1858 (based on larval form).
- = Petromyzon, Malm, Forhandl. Skand. Naturf., 8. möde, p. 580, 1860.
- = Ammocates, GILL, Proc. U. S. Nat. Mus., v. 5, p. 523, 1883.

Petromyzon sp. auct. pl.

Ichthyomyzon sp., GIRARD.

FAMILIES.

In 1870 Dr. Günther united the genera Caragola and Mordacia of Gray, the former of which was based on specimens with the lateral corneous lamellæ preserved, while the latter was founded on a specimen in which they were lost and only exhibiting a single papillary prominence for each. For the combination he prefered the second name of Gray (Mordacia), based on a mutilated individual. In 1882 I used in preference the first name (Caragola), based on a perfect individual. I have since been led to believe that the precedence of one name by such a little margin as Caragola has over Mordacia has no value, and that aptness of diagnosis, however desirable, is not necessary to secure priority, and I have therefore followed Dr. Günther in accepting the name Mordacia instead of Caragola. I have also deemed it proper to elevate the subfamily Caragolinæ to family rank, and named it Mordaciidæ. References follow.

Family MORDACIIDÆ.

- = Caragolina, GILL, Proc. U. S. Nat. Mus., v. 5, p. 524, 1882.
- = Mordaciida, Gill, Mem. Nat. Acad. Sc., v. 6, p. 129, 1893.

Petromyzontidæ pt., auct. pl.

Hyperoartia with two distant lateral tuberculigerous laminæ developed from the upper arch of the annular cartilage.

The only known genus is Mordacia.

With this is to be contrasted the family *Petromyzonidæ* as thus restricted, viz:

Family PETROMYZONIDÆ.

- < Petromyzoutida, GILL, Proc. U. S. Nat. Mus., v. 5, p. 521, 1882. (Full syn. given.)
- = Petromyzontida, GILL, Mem. Nat. Acad. Sc., v. 6, p. 129, 1893.

Hyperoartia with a single median tuberculigerous suproral lamina developed from the upper arch of the annular eartilage.

It behooves those who may object to these families to consider why

the character used to distinguish them is not of equal value with the union or separation of lower pharyngeal bones and like modifications generally used.

ORTHOGRAPHY.

In common with almost all other zoologists, I have used the name Petromyzontidw for the lampreys. It only lately occurred to me that the form was a suspicious one at least, and, on investigation, I have been obliged to believe that it was due to a false analogy. Certainly the analogous Greek word $\mu \dot{o} \xi \omega \nu$ has $\mu \dot{o} \xi \omega \nu o \varepsilon$ in the genitive, and the corresponding Latin equivalents are myxon and myxonis. The first to use the form Petromyzontidw appears to have been Prof. Agassiz, in 1850, in Lake Superior (p. 249), and the Edinburg New Philosophical Journal (v. 49, p. 242). It is probable that he was led to this form, without sufficient reflection, by being misled by analogy with words ending in -odon (Tetraodon, Diodon, etc.). Bonaparte had long before given the better form, Petromyzonidw, and this should be revived.

EXOMEGAS.

The genus Exomegas, proposed in 1882 (Proc. U. S. Nat. Mus., v. 5, p. 524) for the Petromyzon macrostomus of Burmeister, has been justified by the recent publication of a memoir on the species by Dr. C. Berg,* who has, however, referred it to the genus Geotria. I have recently ealled attention in Science for January 19, 1894 (v. 23, p. 30, "A South American lamprey"), to certain discrepancies between the description and figure and the advisability of reexamining the animal.

A detailed comparison of the contrasting skeletal peculiarities of *Petromyzon* and *Lampetra* is very much needed. It may be hoped that Prof. Gage will extend his investigations and give us the requisite information.

^{*}Anales del Museo de la Plata [etc.]. Seccion zoologica I. Geotria macrostoma (Burm.) Berg y Thalassophryne montevidensis Berg.—Buenos Aires—1893.